

### **Remarks**

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-11, and 14-18 are pending in this application.

The examiner is thanked for the helpful telephone discussions of February 4 and 26, 2008, in which proposed examiner's amendments to claim 1 that should put the application in condition for allowance were discussed. The proposed amendments, as shown on page 5 of the Office Action, have been adopted in their entirety in these claim amendments. Additionally, claim 14 has been amended to correct its dependency in view of the previous cancellation of claim 12. No new matter has been added by this amendment and entry thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-11, and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. Specifically, the examiner asserts that a "detectable reporter molecule" requires a signal to be produced so as to allow detection of binding.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 1 has been amended as recommended by the examiner to recite "...such that association of the immunoglobulin to the target leads to a stable interaction between the first molecule and the second molecule; thus producing a detectable reporter molecule that generates a signal; and d) detecting said signal from said detectable reporter molecule, wherein said detection of a signal is indicative of binding between said immunoglobulin and said target in an intracellular environment."

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been overcome and request that this § 112, second paragraph, rejection be withdrawn.

#### **III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph**

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-11, and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for lack of enablement. Specifically, the examiner asserts that the specification, while being enabled for a method whereupon the first and second molecules brought into operative association lead to a stable interaction between the first and second molecules, is not enabled for a method whereupon

the first and second molecules brought into operative association does not lead to a stable interaction.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 1 has been amended as recommended by the examiner to recite “...such that association of the immunoglobulin to the target leads to a stable interaction between the first molecule and the second molecule; thus producing a detectable reporter molecule that generates a signal; and d) detecting said signal from said detectable reporter molecule, wherein said detection of a signal is indicative of binding between said immunoglobulin and said target in an intracellular environment.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been overcome and request that this § 112, first paragraph, rejection be withdrawn.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants believe that the application is in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at the number listed below in order to expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 16, 2008

/Belinda M. Lew/  
Belinda M. Lew, Ph.D.  
Registration No.: 53,212  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP  
1875 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 663-6000 (telephone)  
(202) 663-6363 (facsimile)